



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,174	12/15/2000	Atsuo Kondo	782_141	2301

25191 7590 02/01/2002

BURR & BROWN
PO BOX 7068
SYRACUSE, NY 13261-7068

EXAMINER

MOONEY, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2877

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/738,174

Applicant(s)

KONDO ET AL.

Examiner

Michael P. Mooney

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minakata et al. (6219469) and further in view of McBrien et al. (6341031).

Minakata et al. teaches all of claim 1 with the exception of explicitly teaching the invention being adapted for applying voltage to the first *and* second optical waveguide (OWG) portions to modulate a light propagating the OWG portions. (figs. 1, 2; col. 4, lines 5-32). McBrien et al., however, teaches this. (See fig. 3).

Minakata et al. and McBrien et al. are combined by taking the technology of Minakata et al. which teaches a modulator whose substrate has a thinner portion having a smaller thickness, etc. and applying it to the adapted electrode set technology of

Art Unit: 2877

McBrien et al. to obtain the instant invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make such a combination for the purpose of electrically connecting more than one OWG branch to a high frequency signal circuit. Thus claim 1 is rejected.

Claims 4, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minakata et al. (6219469) and further in view of McBrien et al. (6341031) and further in view of Brinkman et al. (6167169).

The aforementioned Minakata/McBrien combination does not explicitly teach a buffer layer with a taper portion.

Brinkman et al. teaches a buffer layer with a taper portion. (Fig. 12).

The Minakata/McBrien combination and Brinkman et al. are combined by taking the technology of the Minakata/McBrien combination which teaches modulator having a substrate with a thinner portion and adapted electrodes and applying it to the buffer layer with a taper portion technology of Brinkman et al. to obtain the instant invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make such a combination for the purpose of tapering the field strength. Thus claim 4 is rejected.

Minakata et al teaches claim 6. (figs. 1, 2; col. 4, lines 5-32). Thus claim 6 is rejected.

Allowable Subject Matter


Claims 2, 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not disclose or render obvious a deviation in the total length of said plural buffer layers is not more than 0.2 mm in combination with the rest of claim 2.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Mooney whose telephone number is 703-308-6125. The examiner can normally be reached during weekdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G. Font can be reached on 703-308-4881. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956. An alternative useful number for status inquiries is 703-306-3329.


Michael P. Mooney
Examiner
Art Unit 2877


Frank G. Font
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2877

FGF/mpm
1/28/02